

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 20, 22 and 74 under 35 USC 102. These rejections are fully traversed below.

Claim 20 has been amended. Claim 23 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 5-9, 12-16, 18-22, 24-31, 58 and 63-74 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 20, 22 and 74 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Rudy, Jr. et al* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,128,835).

Claims 1 and 74

In contrast to *Rudy*, claim 1 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a housing for enclosing internal components of the portable computing device that provide computing operations for the portable computing device..." *Rudy* does not disclose a computing device let alone a portable computing device. *Rudy* is directed at a current coupler that is affixed at a loop of a twisted pair cable in order to minimize distorting the desired length and shape of the loop. This is a not computing device, and further a device that performs computing operations. The most that can be said is that the assembly is an electronic device that includes a circuit substrate 152 having a plurality of surface mounted electrical components 158. This however does not make it a computing device. Furthermore, *Rudy* appears to be completely silent to performing computing operations. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Also in contrast to *Rudy*, claim 1 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a singular composite structure that both supports the portable computing device and shields the portable computing device from electronic emissions." While *Rudy* may disclose a conductive adhesive

(Col. 10, lines 60-65), *Rudy* does not teach or suggest forming a singular composite structure. In fact, *Rudy* teaches away from a singular composite structure by stating that the top and bottom members 150, 158 are joined together by screws (see Col. 10, line 64). As should be appreciated, the screws can be removed thereby releasing the top and bottom members 150 and 158. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Also in contrast to *Rudy*, claim 74 specifically requires, "wherein the portable computing device is a portable computer including a base and a lid, and wherein the first and second members work together to form at least a portion of the housing of the base or lid." The coupler assembly simply is not a computer, and further a portable computer such as a laptop computer that includes a base and a lid (see Fig. 1 of the present invention). Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Claims 20 and 22

The rejection is moot in lieu of the amendments made above, i.e., claim 20 was amended to include allowable subject matter in order to expedite the prosecution of this case.

Although claim 20 was amended in this manner, it is still believed that the rejection to the previous claim 20 and its dependent 22 are unsupported by the art. In particular, claim 20 specifically requires, "A component of a computer enclosure..." and "...a conductive bridge electrically bonding the first and second conductive surfaces and electrically sealing an interface between the first and second conductive surfaces so as to form a singular conductive structure for shielding electronic emissions..." As mentioned above, *Rudy* is directed at coupler assemblies not computers. This is non analogous art. Furthermore, *Rudy* does not teach or suggest a singular conductive structure. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, claim 22 specifically requires, "...wherein the conductive paste has a compliant state arranged for sealing the interface, and a rigid state for electrically bonding the conductive surfaces of the first and second members together." No such limitation is taught in *Rudy*, i.e., *Rudy* is completely silent to a compliant state and a rigid state. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-9, 12-16, 18, 19, 24-31, 58, 63-71 and 73 have been allowed. In addition, claim 20 has been amended to include the limitations of allowed dependent claim 23. Claim 20 (and its dependents) is therefore allowable as the Examiner indicated allowable subject matter in the previous Office Action.

SUMMARY

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Quin C. Hoellwarth
Reg. No. 45,738

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300